

REMARKS

In the non-final Office Action dated April 29, 2008, it is noted that claims 1 – 45 are pending in the application.

In the present amendment, claims 5, 34, 39, 42 and 44 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 2, 4, 6 – 16, 18, 20 – 22, 24 – 26, 29 – 31, 33, 35, 37, 38, 40, 43 and 45 have been amended for non-statutory reasons, and these claims are not narrowed in scope. Claims 1, 28, 36 and 41 have been amended to incorporate the features from the cancelled claims 5, 34, 39, 42 and 44 respectively. No new matter has been added.

The Office Action objects to the specification because of the following informalities.

- a) Page 2 line 3, “connect devices” should have been “connected devices.”

In the present amendment, the specification has been amended to obviate this objection.

b) Page 4, line 19 controller 301 and transmitter 302 are labeled differently from Fig. 3A. The controller 301 and transmitter 302 in Fig. 3A were labeled with incorrect reference numerals. In the present amendment, Fig. 3A has been amended to obviate this objection.

c) Page 5, line 29, controller “352” is labeled differently from Fig. 3B. The numeral label “352” in the specification should have been “351.” In the present amendment, the specification has been amended to obviate this objection.

The Office further objects to the specification because the following references are incorporated by reference into the specification, but they were not provided to the Office:

- a) “MBOA Wireless Medium Access Control (MAC) Specification for High Rate Wireless Personal Area Network (WPANs), Technical Specification, Draft 0.5, April 2004.”
- b) “WUSB Key Developers, USB-IF, WUSB Micro-scheduling specification, Revision 0.5c, December 2003.”

Applicants will file these references in an IDS for consideration by the Examiner. Withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

The Office Action objects to claims 1, 4, 5, 8 – 10, 12 and 39 for a number of informalities.

In the present amendment, claims 5 and 39 have been cancelled and the claims have been amended to obviate this objection. Withdrawal of the objection to claims 1, 4, 5, 8 – 10, 12 and 39 is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 4 – 6, 8, 10, 12, 20, 35, 39, 40 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Peters et al. (US 2003/0086388), hereinafter “Peters.”

Applicants submit that for at least the following reasons, claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 20, 35, 40 and 45 are patentable over Peters.

For example, claim 1 requires

“beaconing according to a distributed Ultra WideBand Medium Access Control (UWB MAC) protocol by the host and the at least one connected device.”

Peters, paragraph [0054], apparently discloses that a wireless peripheral device waits to receive a polling message and responds to the polling message with a unique peripheral address or the received port number. However, Peters does not disclose that this waiting and responding of polling message is the beaconing according to a distributed UWB MAC protocol. Applicants submit that nothing in Peters teaches or suggests the use of any distributed UWB MAC protocol. Furthermore, Peters, paragraph [0036], apparently discloses that key management and encryption unit perform encryption and decryption of messages, but does not mention any distributed UWB MAC protocol. Therefore, Peters fails to disclose the claimed feature: beaconing according to a distributed Ultra WideBand Medium Access Control (UWB MAC) protocol by the host and the at least one connected device.

Furthermore, claim 1 also requires:

*“wherein said beaconing comprising
including capabilities of the host in a host beacon; and
including capabilities of the at least one connected device in a connected device beacon.”*

Peters, Abstract, apparently discloses that during each period, the hub sends a polling message through each of its wireless port and awaits a response; and that a peripheral device that wishes to attach to the system responds to the message by sending its unique peripheral address. However, Applicants submit that Peters does not teach or suggest that the polling message includes the capabilities of the host, or that the response includes the capabilities of the peripheral device. Therefore, Peters fails to disclose the claimed feature: wherein said beaconing comprising including capabilities of the host in a host beacon; and including capabilities of the at least one connected device in a connected device beacon.

In view of at least the foregoing, claim 1 is patentable over Peters.

Similarly, independent claim 20 requires:

*“start beaconing according to a distributed UWB MAC protocol and announce host capabilities,
receive and process according to a distributed UWB MAC protocol, beacons of the at least one connected device including capabilities of the at least one device.”*

As discussed above, Peters does not teach or disclose that the beaconing is in accordance with a distributed UWB MAC protocol, or that the host beacon includes the capabilities of the host and a connected device beacon includes the capabilities of the connected device. Therefore, Peters fails to disclose the claimed feature: start beaconing according to a distributed UWB MAC protocol and announce host capabilities, receive and process according to a distributed UWB MAC protocol, beacons of the at least one connected device including capabilities of the at least one device. Therefore, claim 20 is patentable over Peters.

In addition, each of the independent claims 28, 36 and 41 requires:

*“beaconing according to a distributed UWB MAC protocol by the host and the at least one connected device,” and
“wherein said beaconing comprising
including capabilities of the host in a host beacon; and
including capabilities of the at least one connected device in a connected device beacon.”*

Applicants essentially repeat the above arguments for claim 1 and apply them to claims 28, 36 and 41 pointing out why Peters fails to disclose the feature: beaconing according to a

distributed UWB MAC protocol by the host and the at least one connected device, or the feature: wherein said beaconing comprising including capabilities of the host in a host beacon; and including capabilities of the at least one connected device in a connected device beacon. Therefore, Applicants submit that for at least the above reasons, claims 28, 36 and 41 are patentable over Peters.

Claims 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 35, 40 and 45 are patentable because at least they respectively depend from claims 1, 28, 36 and 41, with each claim containing further distinguishing features.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 20, 35, 40 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claims 2, 3, 7, 9, 11, 13 – 19, 21 – 34, 36 – 38 and 41 – 44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Peters in view of IEEE Std 802.15.3-2003, hereinafter “IEEE”.

Applicants submit that IEEE does not in any way cure the defects pointed out above with respect to Peters. Thus, claims 1, 20, 28, 36 and 41 are patentable over Peters and IEEE, either singly or in combination.

Claims 2, 3, 7, 9, 11, 13 – 19, 21 – 34, 37, 38 and 42 – 44 are patentable because they respectively depend from claims 1, 20, 28, 36 and 41, with each claim containing further distinguishing features.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 3, 7, 9, 11, 13 – 19, 21 – 34, 36 – 38 and 41 – 44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance. Entry of this amendment, reconsideration, and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited. In the event there are any errors with respect to the fees for this response or any other papers related to this response, the Director is hereby given permission to charge any shortages and credit any overcharges of any fees required for this submission to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian S. Myers/

By: Brian Myers,
Registration No.: 46,947
For: Larry Liberchuk,
Registration No.: 40,352

Mail all correspondence to:

Larry Liberchuk, Registration No. 40,352
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001